DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 127 HE 017 983

AUTHOR Kerr, Clark
TITLE Impressions 1984: Higher Education Once Again in Transition. The Sixth Earl V. Pullias Lecture in Higher and Postsecondary Education.
INSTITUTION University of Southern California, Los Angeles. Dept. of Higher and Postsecondary Education.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 20p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Environment; College Role; Declining Enrollment; Economic Factors; Education Work Relationship; *Higher Education; Institutional Advancement; *Leadership Responsibility; Retrenchment; School Surveys; *Student Educational Objectives; Trend Analysis; Vocational Interests

ABSTRACT

Perspectives on higher education and its leadership are offered by the president emeritus of the University of California. Six impressions concerning higher education are considered, based on about 800 interviews conducted by a presidential leadership commission sponsored by the Association of Governing Boards. In addition to the perception that leadership in colleges has deteriorated, large variations in the leadership and quality of different types of institutions, as well as the tone of campuses, are apparent. A great burden of uncertainty is apparent at U.S. campuses, with concern directed to enrollment and financial support. On the college campus, there appears among students a new emphasis upon individual economic advancement through concentration on vocational subjects. This shift toward vocational programs leading to a job greatly influences the faculties and the administration and resources of campuses. In addition, even in relatively small institutions, there is much less of a sense of community then in the past. The final impression is the sense of a lack of mission in American higher education. Rather than having a mission, most colleges and universities seemed to be focused on institutional survival. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED254127

Earl V. Pullias

Lecture In Higher Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Clare L. Dufton
Univ. of Southern California

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

University of Southern California

1984

HE 017983

Clark Kerr

THE 1984 PULLIAS LECTURE

IMPRESSIONS 1984: HIGHER EDUCATION ONCE AGAIN IN TRANSITION

by

Clark Kerr
President Emeritus
University of California

The Sixth Earl V. Pullias Lecture in Higher and Postsecondary Education

1984

Published by the Pullias Lectureship Endowment Fund, the Department of Higher and Postsecondary Education, School of Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California 90089-0031.

"Higher education carries a heavy responsibility in modern society. No institution has greater opportunities to contribute significantly to the upward movement which modern man must achieve. Higher education at its best is the only institution in modern society that is free to seek answers to all the problems that confront man, through the use of every method the mind of man can conceive. By its very nature the primary allegiance of higher education is to truth: its discovery, its wide dissemination, and its effective application to the questions of life."

Earl V. Pullias in
Toward Excellence in College Teaching

Earl V. Pullias is professor emeritus at the University of Southern California. He has been a teacher, administrator, and consultant. He remains an active civic leader. A graduate of Cumberland University (Tennessee), he earned a master's at University of Chicago, and then a Ph.D. from Duke University. After initial work as a psychologist, he came to Pepperdine College as a professor, and shortly after, Dean of the Faculty. In 1957, he came to the University of Southern California to establish the Department of Higher and Postsecondary Education.

He is a prolific writer, with efforts in the last twenty years directed towards the philosophical issues in the higher learning. Dr. Pullias has published more than 100 research and theoretical articles and reviews. His book (with James D. Young) *A Teacher is Many Things* has been translated into nine languages and received international recognition. Other works include *Towards Excellence in College Teaching* (with Aileene Lockhart), *A Search for Understanding*, and his last work, *A Common Sense Philosophy for Modern Man: A Search for Fundamentals.*

He and his wife, Pauline, live in Los Angeles.

THE PULLIAS LECTURESHIP...

As Professor Earl V. Pullias approached emeritus status, many of his former students and friends asked for an opportunity to express tanglibly their affection and respect. Professor Pullias expressed a desire to have these efforts directed towards establishing a lectureship in the Department of Higher and Postsecondary Education and School of Education at the University of Southern California.

The Department was first formed in 1961 with Professor Pullias as its chairman. Since that time, over 400 students have received their doctorates from the Department.

The Lectureship was arranged to bring a nationally recognized scholar to the campus that would augment Departmental programs for the faculty and student environment. The publication and national dissemination of the lectureship presentations was designed to add to the ongoing academic dialogue on significant topics in higher and postsecondary education.

A Steering Committee has served to initial the Pullias Lectureship and was composed of Dr. Leslie Wilbur, University of Southern California; Dr. Roger Hendrix, University of Southern California; Dr. William Millington, University of Southern California; Dr. Clive L. Grafton, University of Southern California; Dr. Virginia Pfiffner, El Camino College; Dr. Viktor Christensen, Loma Linda University; Dr. Hamilton Maddaford, El Camino College; Dr. John Grande, Glendale College; Dr. Robert Rupert, Los Angeles Unified School District; Dr. David Leveille, California State University and Colleges; Dr. James Young, California State University, Fullerton; Dr. Wayne Frarie, University of Southern California; Dr. John Cashin, Santa Monica College; Mrs. Nell Privett.

Introduction for Dr. Clark Kerr at the Sixth Annual Pullias Lecture in Higher Education at the University of Southern California, March 10, 1984

by Leslie Wilbur, Ph.D.
Professor
University of Southern California

As an alumnus of the University of California and Professor of Higher Education, I feel doubly honored to introduce Dr. Clark Kerr. I must confess to loyalty shared between the University of California and the University of Southern California. My wife, Norma, and I both took degrees at Berkeley and we both also have degrees from USC. While our most recent years have been here, we continue to be proud of our student years at Cal and to be keenly aware of the international reputation of our early alma mater.

From Dr. Pullias' 680 course on higher education in the United States, many of us learned about Dr. Kerr's philosophy and activities. Many of us recall his comments in the Godkin lectures. Most of us can recall the stream of news stories about the confrontation between the UC president and political forces threatening higher education. We also know Dr. Kerr from his more recent writings as chairman and director of the Carnegie Commission. We've all been very much aware of Dr. Kerr's sustained major influence on American higher education. His roots in the rural community of Oaley Valley, Pennsylvania, are similar to those of Dr. Pullias in rural Tennessee. In 1932, Dr. Kerr, a recent graduate of Swarthmore, was studying at Stanford and visited the Berkeley campus, where even then students were demonstrating. For an American field service activist of the thirties, which he was, the spirit of peace at Cal was irresistable. Later he received his Ph.D. in Economics at Cal, Berkeley, and the rest is mingled with the history of higher education.

In the forties, he joined the Berkeley faculty in economics and established the institute of industrial relations. He was on the faculty during the loyalty oath controversy and delivered an early and vigorous protest to the regents over that issue. After serving as a chancellor of the Berkeley campus, in July

of 1958 he became the twelfth president of the University of California. He spent the next nine years wrestling with the problems of expansion when the university doubled its size, growing from 43,000 to 88,000 students and adding three new campuses.

His subsequent years on the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies were the years of the famous series of Carnegie reports — a broad range of documents issued or sponsored by the council and commission.

In April of 1981, almost 50 years after his first trip to the University of California, he was honored on Charter Day as Alumnus of the Year by the California Alumnae Association. It was difficult to limit my comments to a few highlights of a prestigious career. Let me say that we are delighted and honored to welcome you as the Sixth Pullias Lecturer, University of California President Emeritus, Dr. Kerr.

IMPRESSIONS 1984:

HIGHER EDUCATION ONCE AGAIN IN TRANSITION

By

Clark Kerr
President Emeritus
University of California

Thank you for your kind introduction; and Dean Pullias — I still call him Dean Pullias because that is how I knew him first — and friends of Professor Pullias. If I had not known in advance that all of you would be here this evening because you were friends of Professor Pullias, I certainly discovered it tonight. Earl has been hugged and kissed by more women this evening than I have in my whole life. And as I have been sitting beside him, people would come up and they would say, "Professor Pullias, I'm here for one reason only this evening and that is to shake your hand." Or they would say, "I'm here for only one reason this evening and that is to see you again," or "to hear you speak." And I have been sitting here thinking, what am I doing here tonight?

It is a pleasure, of course, to be here to participate in this series. As Earl said, we have known each other now for more than a quarter of a century, and I have had great admiration for him during all those years. In trying to decide what I might talk about tonight, I read recent writings of Dean Pullias and a number of comments which I am going to make will parallel areas in which he has been interested and written upon in recent times.

I have been engaged for more than two years now in a project which has taken me to institutions of higher education all across the country and has given me a chance to see them in a certain amount of depth. It is a project under the sponsorship of the Association of Governing Boards, the association which represents the 50,000 trustees of American colleges and universities. They set up a commission to look into what has happened to leadership of American higher education under the title, "Strengthening Presidential Leadership." The commission, composed of 17 people and of which I am chairman, will make recommendations in a document to be released next October. In addition there will be studies written by Professor David Riesman of Harvard who will study some institutions in great depth, and a monograph which I will write describing what I have seen across the country. I would

like to share with you some observations from that study, because in talking with the presidents one learns a good deal about the institutions and about higher education, about American life, also a good deal about human nature.

We have done a great deal of interviewing. I have talked with about 400 people in about 40 states. There have been others involved in the project including the members of the commission, a. of whom have done some interviewing; altogether we have talked to some 800 people. We will have talked with people in every state of the nation, in all types of institutions. I was interested in looking at the list of former lecturers in this series and noted that we have interviewed three of them for their wisdom — Ernest Boyer, Ann Reynolds, and Dale Parnell. I have had a kind of what the Australians would call a "walkabout" in American higher education, and want to give you some impressions of what I see in 1984. At the end, I would like to say a word placing 1984 in longer historical prespective. I have chosen six impressions to comment upon very briefly.

First of all, what has happened to leadership? The trustees of American colleges and universities started this project on their own initiative because of their perception that leadership had deteriorated. They asked us to find out — was that true? Their main perceptions were that it was getting harder to get people to serve as presidents of colleges and universities — that turns out to be true; that their terms were shorter than they had been historically — that turns out to be true. And then third, and most particularly, they felt that a good many presidents were so involved for one reason or another with daily matters, that they were frequently neglecting the long run future of their institutions. In talking with many of these presidents, they themselves agreed that this is true and then gave their reasons.

I define leadership, as compared with management in a presidency, as follows: A leader is a person who sets new goals or higher standards for the performance of old goals, and then mobilizes the efforts of the campus to achieve these goals. Recently I read one of Dr. Pullias' comments giving his definition of leadership. It is very much the same as mine, defining a leader as a person who has clear vision and who then is able to help those in the organization to follow the direction of that vision toward the desired goals. As Dean Pullias has also commented, the problem of leadership is not unique to higher education. It is a general problem seen in other areas of American life — in corporate life, trade unions, and in government. He wrote that there is a negative attitude

toward leadership at all levels of life. "I do not claim to understand the source of this attitude, I only know it as a dangerous situation and quite pervasive." He went on to say how important it is to have strong leadership in the conduct of a democracy.

There is a lack of respect for leadership in many parts of American society today. It is perhaps most notable upon campuses, among faculty and among students; and the presidents feel it. They are not only constrained by this attitude toward authority; they find themselves increasingly constrained by the regulations of the federal government, and by state governments if they are public institutions, and by the courts in institutions both private and public. Richard Lyman, now the president of the Rockefeller Foundation and formerly president of Stanford, told me that in his last year as president of Stanford, there had been more law suits against him and Stanford University than during the whole twenty years that Wallace Sterling had been president of Stanford before him.

Likewise, over a period of years, coordinating councils have been established over both public and private institutions. More and more public institutions find themselves within systems, with layers of governance over them. In addition, there has been an end to growth of higher education; and it is in a period of growth that leadership particularly can be exercised, making use of the new resources. Now more frequently there is a problem of cutting back. Also, as Dr. Pullias said in his opening remarks, there is an increasing fractionalization of people where we ought to be more unified. The campuses across the country have become divided more and more by interest groups, particularly if they face decline. Everyone wonders who is going to decline, who is going to survive. There are all kinds of caucuses. There is no such thing anymore as "a student government." Once upon a time a president could talk with the head of student government and that was it. Now it is necessary to talk to this caucus, to that caucus, and another caucus — all feeling that they must have given their consent or the new policy is not acceptable. So as the trustees suspected, there has been a deterioration of leadership, and it can be costly to higher education because there are many problems ahead to be solved.

A second impression I received going around the country is the tremendous variation in institutions, including the quality and the authority of leadership, but also in the tone of campuses. I have found that the campuses which seem now to have the most dynamic leadership and the most sense of pur-

pose fall into several quite distinct categories. One finds leadership still largely unimpeded, although not totally, in the old elite institutions of the Ivy League. Harvard has had a president since 1636 and it is a position with great prestige in the nation, and particularly in the Boston community. The presidency also has a good tone in those parts of the United States where the communities are still growing rapidly. One finds this condition in Tucson or Phoenix or Salt Lake City or Miami or Houston, as compared with Connecticut or Ohio, or many other places.

Another area of high tone of leadership in campus life is among the evangelical institutions of this country which constitute at the present time, one might say, the most successful individual segment of American higher education. Depending on how you define "evangelical," there are perhaps 125 to 150 such institutions. They have more students than ever before, more gifts than ever before; employers are taking their graduates, often hiring them before commencement day. In these institutions, leadership is still strong and there is a very great sense of purpose.

I have also found this high morale in the new Hispanic institutions of which there are perhaps 10 or 12 across the nation — I have been to about eight of them. Hispanic institutions are defined as those where the president and the majority or plurality of the students are Hispanic. There is a sense that the community is moving forward and that the president is the leader, not only of the campus, but of the community as a whole. At the other extreme, I find great distress among presidents, and on the campuses, in many community colleges. Twenty years ago they were riding high and were the most dynamic part of American higher education; but now, for a good many reasons, including in almost every state because of increasing domination by state authorities and loss of local autonomy, there has been a deterioration in leadership.

I find also, in this lower category, the historically black colleges of the United States. The black community, having gained substantially, now feels it is losing. The black colleges find that what were once their best students, and all their best athletes are being taken by the historically white institutions. The presidents of the black colleges, rather than being looked upon as the leader of the community, as in the Hispanic colleges, find themselves criticized on their own campuses for being out there dealing with the white establishment. I would place in the lower category a good many of the comprehensive colleges, particularly teachers' colleges in the declining areas

of the nation in the Middle West and New England.

There is one other great variation. Generally it can be said that the quality of governance in the private institutions is becoming quite superior to that in the public institutions partly because the quality of the boards and their procedures and policies have been improving, but also because generally the quality of governance at public institutions has declined. This is partly a result of the fractionalization of American society, the fractionalization of boards, and people who are brought on to boards to represent some constituency are particularly anxious to get into operations and not remain policy makers.

A third impression, and here is an area where Dr. Pullias has also commented in recent times: There is a great burden of uncertainty hanging over the campuses of the United States and over their executive leaders. There is uncertainty about enrollment. The size of the college-going age cohort by 1997 will have gone down by 23.5 percent from what it was in 1980. What impact will this have on higher education and on individual institutions? There are economists who are predicting a decline in enrollment quite beyond the 23.5 percent because they add on to the impact of the demographic depression the fact that the rate of return on a college education in the course of the last 15 years has gone down by 50 percent — what economists call the private economic rate of return on what it costs a student to go to college including the lost income while in college. Considered as an investment, the payoff in higher earnings has dropped from a rate of a very good investment to what today would be considered a relatively poor investment. Another way of stating it is this: Fifteen years ago, a college graduate could count on having a lifetime income 50 percent greater than that of a high school graduate. That figure has dropped now to 25 percent. And so predictors put together the demographic depression and the decline in the rate of return and expect declines in enrollment of 30 to 40 percent. I personally do not see that. The Carnegie Commission and Council made several studies of this problem, and we concluded that the decline would be much more moderate as older people renew their education or complete it, as more women enter higher education and as more members of minority groups go to college, as here in Southern California, particularly the Hispanic group. But the great uncertainty about enrollment and the great uncertainty about financial support remain.

For a decade, the gross national product in real terms has not grown at the rate it did from 1945 to 1970 — the great

golden age of the American economy. It is unlikely that ever again, as far as we can see ahead, will it grow at those rates, and so there are fewer resources to go around. Other priorities have arisen, too, such as national defense given the world situation; and more money for the high schools — well deserved but in competition with higher education.

In terms of private support, we are going through a long term increase in the hedonistic attitude of parents — various economic studies show this. Parents are more inclined to spend money on themselves than on their children. There is what economists call "high income elasticity" for travel abroad, a second or third car, joining country clubs, and a lower elasticity for spending money on the education of their children. This is one of the reasons why federal support for students in higher education in the last 20 years has gone up nine times over, replacing parental support, and to some extent also self support by students. This long term hedonistic trend — "use it on yourself and now" — has to be of some concern. Another concern in very many places is the spread of unionization. What will that mean to the campus as faculty members come to look upon themselves more as employees than as colleagues? As faculty salaries lose out comparatively in the nation, the pressure for unionization may grow and become a matter of increasing concern across the country.

Now let me mention, as a fourth point, some changing themes on the college campus. Everywhere among students there is a new emphasis upon individual economic advancement through concentration on vocational subjects rather than on the total advancement of human life by developing new cultural interests or new interests as citizens, in the welfare of the American society and the world. Individual economic advancement has become the central theme. This is having an impact all over the country as students choose their colleges on the basis of whether or not they can get the vocational studies they would like and the placement they would like. Once they get to a college, the choice of the fields which they decide to follow has resulted in the great decline of the humanities as compared with the great growth of the undergraduate professional schools. These choices require an enormous redistribution of resources on campus, and cause enormous inequalities, and as a consequence a good deal of bickering within faculties. As the number of students in the humanities goes down, the humanities professors have smaller student loads. The teaching load of a professor in business administration may be two to four times as high. This enormous shift — I think beyond anything that has hap-

pened in American history so quickly — toward following vocational programs leading to a job is having a great impact on the faculties and the administration and the resources of campus after campus.

Another theme that I have referred to briefly already is the sense of fractionalization of campuses: Field versus field, caucus versus caucus. Even in relatively small institutions, the presidents and faculty leaders tell me that there is much less of a sense of community than there once was. This is my fifth observation.

My sixth and final impression is the sense of a lack of mission in American higher education. There was a great sense of mission after Sputnik, to catch up with the Russians. and we did scientifically and passed them. Then in the sixties there was a great emphasis upon growth and we grew at a fantastic rate. In the seventies the mission was social justice. We have opened up opportunity faster and to more people than any nation ever has in the history of the world. But the mission today seems to be more for institutional survival, and survival of parts of institutions, than any overarching mission. There is not the same feeling that higher education is serving the nation as in the earlier periods. There are exceptions. I have felt a great sense of mission at the religiously oriented institutions. They have always had a sense of mission; but particularly at the present time those who feel that they are creating a protected and advantageous environment for the development of American youth feel it very deeply. This is also true in institutions that primarily serve minorities. There is still a sense of mission in the historically black institutions, a great sense of mission in the newly developed Hispanic institutions. The president I talked to who had the greatest sense of mission of all was in the most impossible place I have been in the United States — Hostos Community College in the south Bronx. I had a hard time getting a cab driver to take me there. I had to promise to pay him double. I had to agree — it was last summer — that he could roll up the windows and lock the doors no matter how hot it was without air conditioning. He would not go into the south Bronx with windows opened or doors that could be opened. I got to what I suppose was an old high school building in an area where buildings all around had been burned down or all the windows broken. I waited awhile and then the president came in, a woman with stars in her eyes. Everything she did every day was serving people — largely a Puerto Rican population, teaching them English so they could get jobs. But also she had on her staff people who would help the students and the members of their families

when they were burned out of a building, as the landlords burn buildings to get the insurance. So in some places there is a great sense of mission, although for higher education as a whole, I would say it is not what we have known in times past.

These impressions of 1984 are rather gloomy, I realize. The decline of effective leadership, the burden of uncertainties, the emphasis upon economic advancement of students to the exclusion of other concerns that many of us think they should have, the disintegration of the sense of community on campuses, the absence of overall inspiration and vision. I have put on the positive side, however, one of my impressions — that is, of the enormous diversity of American higher education, reflecting the diversity of American life; and providing institutions which can grow and decline and change and enrich American life. They provide enormous choice to American young people.

This gloomy picture that I have given of higher education reflects not just upon higher education but also on the state of the world today — fully realized by the young people of today and upon the state of the nation, including concern about the future of the economy. It is not surprising that higher education should reflect what is happening to the world and to the nation as well as to itself. But I believe this period, beginning with the year 1984, is a temporary period. And I would like to suggest that, by the year 2000, the situation will be very greatly changed again. Whoever gives the Pullias Lecture then may talk in quite a different way. Then the size of the age cohort is going to go up once again. The demographic depression will be over and along will come the grandchildren and the great-grandchildren of the G.I.s. That will be a very substantial demographic increase.

There will then be an opportunity to replace, if I may put this down as an opportunity, all those faculty members who were hired in the 1960s and the 1970s and in one decade to virtually replace the entire faculty with new people reflecting new fields, creating a possibility for a whole renaissance of higher education. All those buildings we built in the 1960s will need to be torn down and built again — I hope sometimes in a better style.

But beyond what may begin to happen in the year 2000, let me conclude by referring to something written by Plato a long time ago. Plato wrote that the wheel of education once set in motion moves at an ever faster pace. This has not always been true in history but is certainly true in the modern world. To quote Dean Pullias once again, "Education is the most important task in any society at any time." If he had said that

in a seminar and I was one of his students, I would have challenged him. I would say this is not true in all societies at all times, because I can think of societies where education was not all that important. But it is certainly true in industrial societies and in post-industrial societies, particularly if they are also democratic. We need higher and higher skills all the time for the sake of production, as well as for the sake of consumption so that people can use their time and their funds better as educated people do, and also as citizens.

I think a basic conviction about the future of higher education in the longer run totally overwhelms these impressions which I have been giving you of 1984 — the period of this moment, the period of the beginning of the demographic depression to 1997. If we were giving impressions, say of 1636 to 1984, they would be different than just this year alone; or of 2000 to 2010, they would again be different. We need to see 1984 within the longer flow of time.

The challenge before higher education is that this particular period be mastered in such a way that we minimize the losses to higher education and maximize the potential gains to that higher education, despite this time of troubles, ends up in the year 2000 even stronger than in 1984. We will need it in the year 2000 even more than we need it now. I would suggest that each of us, much as we worry about today and tomorrow, try to comprehend both the transitory and the enduring in the same flight of thought.

RESPONSE TO THE SIXTH ANNUAL PULLIAS LECTURE

by

Earl V. Pullias
Professor Emeritus
University of Southern California

Mr. Chairman, President Kerr, and other friends of the higher learning: As president Kerr mentioned at the beginning of his address, it has been the custom on these occasions for me to make a brief response to the principal lecture, a process which our lecturer this evening would enjoy. I, too, would like such an interchange of thought with President Kerr, but after careful consideration, we decided to shift the format having me do the invocation and a brief welcome—a major response seemed to open up the danger of having two main speeches in one evening. Not a good prospect we thought.

I do wish to express my personal appreciation and I am sure the appreciation of this audience for the excellent quality of our sixth lecture. President Kerr clearly caught the spirit of this occasion and deeply sensed its major purposes of fellowship and of thought exchange. It is inspiring to have a fresh, direct report of significant research now in process — like ore fresh from the digging.

You have helped us to think anew and more deeply about the crisis in leadership in higher education and, in a larger sense, in all of our society. Of your six observations, I suspect the one relating to fragmentation and confusion of purpose is most serious, reflecting the central danger in our civilization. We are, it seems, in a great transition period in the history of humanity: a time when many of the old beliefs and ways will no longer do and the urgently needed new behavior and beliefs have not yet taken firm shape.

The problems you described are demanding — in some cases, beyond our abilities and skills — but as you have pointed out in your concluding statement, they are in no sense hopeless. The higher learning as we know it has been developing for more than a thousand years in western culture and in central essence since Plato's fertile mind conceived the process now more than two thousand years ago. It is our faith that the higher learning, so long as it is reasonably true to its basic nature, has the ability to solve its own problems as it does its matchless work of teaching and research. We are, thus, sustained by a hope that we believe is soundly based.

THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER AND POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION...

The Department of Higher and Postsecondary Education has emphasized in its curriculum an approach to the very important relationship between the American Society and its education efforts within the higher learning. The interrelationships of thematic concepts in the development of higher and postsecondary education is a core aspect of each student's work within the Department.

Doctoral degree programs in the Department are available in a number of specializations for community junior college specialists, prospective staff members of senior institutions, as well as those already employed at public or private colleges or universities. In addition, master's, doctoral, and postdoctoral programs are available for students wishing to specialize in educational services, adult and continuing education, international higher education, career education and allied health professions. A specialized doctorate is also available in college student personnel services, in conjunction with the Department of Counseling. Certificate problems are available in adult training and adult counseling, the latter also jointly with the Department of Counseling.

Degree and certificate program developments have permitted the Department of Higher and Postsecondary Education to utilize nearby institutions as a resource of training facilities for teachers, counselors, and administrators. Wide opportunities for research have also been made available, dealing with current issues and needs within various fields. Although an emphasis of Departmental effort is with preparation of professionals, research in related fields of professional development is also stressed.

New programmatic thrusts that have been generated over the past few years include expansion of the adult and continuing education program, marked by addition of a full-time faculty member with this specialization; joint development with the Department of Counseling of a College Student Personnel Program; further development of course offerings that reflect international higher education interests; the funding of the Earl V. Pullias Lectureship, and where possible, for other services to the Department or the University.

PREVIOUS PULLIAS LECTURERS

1979—Norman Topping, M.D., Sc.D., LL.D., L.H.D.
Chancellor, University of Southern California

1980—Ernest L. Boyer, Ph.D., President, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

1981—Paul E. Hadley, Ph.D., Academic Vice President, University of Southern California

1982—Dale Parnell, Ed.D., President, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

1983—W. Ann Reynolds, Ph.D., Chancellor, The California State Universities

The 1984 PULLIAS LECTURE is a publication of the Department of Higher and Postsecondary Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 90089-0031. The 1984 lecture monograph was edited by Clive L. Grafton. Printing was by Oxford Printing under the direction of Craig France.